

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,102	11/26/2003	Kazuhisa Saito	KPO10201	1302
25271 75	7590 05/11/2005		EXAMINER	
GALLAGHER & LATHROP, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION			TRINH, MINH N	
601 CALIFOR	NIA ST			
SUITE 1111		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN FRANCIS	ISCO, CA 94108		3729	

DATE MAILED: 05/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8	10×10×10×10×10×10×10×10×10×10×10×10×10×1	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summan	10/723,102	SAITO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Minh Trinh	3729
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·	
	action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	· · ·	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 10-24 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 10-24 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		· · · · ·
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • •
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No. <u>09/844,226</u> . ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	n□ · •	(DTO 440)
1) ⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) [_] Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/723,102 Page 2

Art Unit: 3729

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' amendment to the claims filed on 3/9/05 has been considered and made of record.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claimed subject matter such as "removing a portion of said highly wettable finish plating layer by means of a mechanical processing technique" (see claim 9, lines 9-10) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering

Application/Control Number: 10/723,102

Art Unit: 3729

of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. Claims 9-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following are examples:

"said exposed region of said highly wettable base member" (claim 9, line 11) lacks proper antecedent basis. It appears applicants are referring to "the exposed region of the poorly wettable base member instead of the highly wettable base member. Please clarify.

"the step of forming the exposed region is carried out . . . "(claim 10, line 7-8, and claim 19, lines 7-8) lack proper antecedent basis. Because it is unclear as to whether this step is directed to the step of forming an exposed region of the poorly wettable base member as previous cited in independent claim 9, line 8 or that as recited in line 11. Please clarify

Also, "the thus formed primer plating layer" (claim 10, line 6) lacks proper antecedent basis.

5. Claims 9, 14 and 16 as best understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fushimi (6,049,039).

Fushimi discloses the product by process comprising steps of constructing a base member 8 having a surface which is poorly wettable to a weld brazing material (see Fig. 3); a finishing plating layer 10 on the base member 8 which is highly wettable to the weld brazing material (see Fig. 3). Regarding the step of forming an exposed region of said poorly wettable base member by removing a portion of the highly wettable finish plating layer by means of a mechanical processing technique. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to selectively forming an exposed region of said poorly wettable base member by removing a portion of the highly wettable finish plating layer by means of a mechanical processing technique since applicant has not disclosed that the process steps as described above are critical, patentably distinguishing features and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the teaching as taught by Fushimi reference.

Furthermore, removing an unwanted portion or a portion of a highly wettable by a means of mechanical processing technique is old and well known in the art. One ordinary having skill on the art at the time of the invention was made would know to employ a means of mechanical processing technique including at least one of mechanical cutting or grinding, laser beam machining, etc., in order to form a desired structure.

Limitations of claims 14 and 16 are also met by the discussion above.

6. Claim 11 as best under stood is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fushimi in view of Fister et al (5,916,695).

As applied to claim 11, noticing the Fushimi discloses the finish plating layer being Tin, however Fushimi is silent about the base member being copper. Fister et al teach the contact base member is copper. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the Fister et al teachings of contact member being copper onto the modified invention of Fushimi in order to obtain a desired contact member. Furthermore, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use copper as base member and Tin as a preferred material, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejected claims 9 and 11-14 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The amendment to the claims raises new issues of 112 (see paragraph 4 above).

8. Claims 10, 12, 13, 15 and 17-24 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,102 Page 6

Art Unit: 3729

Conclusion

9. Please provide numeral references to the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure (i.e., page and line numbers and reference number associated with from the drawings) for better clarity. Applicant requires to point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure and the claims. See 37CFR 1.111 and section 2163.06 of the MPEP.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4569. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

Art Unit: 3729

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mirth Trinh 5/9/05 Primary Examiner